## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, and 24-26 are the remaining independent claims in the present application. Each of these claims includes a limitation neither disclosed by nor made obvious in view of the prior art.

For example, each independent claim now includes a limitation of "presenting an indication of all of the identified documents . . . wherein the indication includes a single list of the two or more names along with their associated values, ordered according to the values". This limitation is supported by the originally-filed specification at [30] which states "the context term 'genes' is expanded to show its associated terms, the individual gene names, ranked in order according to the search criteria, 'calcium.'" The "associated values" are the determined "frequency of occurrence values for each of the two or more names in the identified documents".

As noted in the Office Action at page 4, lines 15-16, Turnbull does not teach "frequency of occurrence of names within identified documents."

Tso shows using attributes to generate sorted search results. Tso at col. 5, lines 39-40. However, Tso's approach does not produce the same results as the present invention and Tso teaches away in several respects from the present invention. Tso's results, as shown in Figure 3C, for example, are not ordered according to a "frequency of occurrence." In fact, the information in the user interface of Figure 3C of Tso is not even provided to show search result conclusions. Rather, it is provided as a screen from which the user may select categories for study and the hit counts are only offered to "help the user determine which of the user-selectable categories he or she might want to chose." This non-ordering according to hit count or values teaches away from the present invention where a great deal of utility is obtained by the specific ordering according to values.

The present invention provides deterministic results by "presenting an indication of all of the identified documents to a user". Tso teaches away from this approach by advising "filtering" of results at col. 5, lines 17-20. "[W]here a query results in a large number of matching data items, it is often useful to reduce the amount of matching data items by discarding matching data items that do not satisfy a minimum relevance threshold." Likewise, if there are too few search results, then Tso's approach is not even used (see Tso at col. 4, line 65 through col. 5, line 2). Tso also recommends using different algorithms to produce different groupings (Tso at col. 6,

lines 13-24). This leads to the important point that Tso's "categories" are not the same as the context "names" of the present invention.

Tso's entire approach is directed to "dynamic categorization". This means that in Tso the categories are only determined after the initial search results are obtained and they are based on the search results. "Dynamic categorization allows search result categories to be generated on a search-by-search basis while ensuring that all matching data items are assigned to at least one search result category." Tso at col. 3, lines 61-64. This is in stark contrast to Applicant's invention which uses a "predetermined list of two or more names". The names are already predetermined at the step where a user is selecting the context, or list of the names. Since the names are predetermined they are not "generated on a search-by-search basis" as taught by Tso. There is no way to use this teaching of Tso in combination with any other reference to arrive at Applicant's invention that uses a "predetermined list of two or more names."

Applicant respectfully submits that the present claims are in condition for allowance and an early Notice of Allowance is earnestly sought. The undersigned may be contacted at the 415-279-5098 at the Examiner's convenience if it would help in the prosecution of this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

TRELLIS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP, PC

By____/ Charles J. Kulas /____
Charles J. Kulas
Reg. No. 35,809
Tel.: 415-279-5098